UNITY

FREEDOM FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor 1880-1918)

Editors

John Haynes Holmes **Francis Neilson**

Facing the Facts in the Church Situation

By EDMUND H. REEMAN

100 Per Cent Americanism

A Medical Report

By JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

The Russian Tragedy

By BRENT DOW ALLINSON

VOLUME LXXXVIII NUMBER 11

Chicago, November 24, 1921

PUBLISHED WEEKLY

UNITY

(Established 1878)

Subscription, $3.00 per Annum

A Journal of the Religion of Democracy

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES : *Editors* : FRANCIS NEILSON

UNITY Fellowship

FRANK C. DOAN
CHARLES F. DOLE
JESSE H. HOLMES
JOHN HAYNES HOLMES
HENRY R. MUSSEY
FRANCIS NEILSON
EDMUND H. REEMAN
ALSON H. ROBINSON
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
ANNA GARLIN SPENCER
SIDNEY STRONG
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Managing Editor

EDITH LLOYD JONES

Vol. 1 March 1, 1878 No. 1

THE

Pamphlet Mission

FOR

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP & CHARACTER

IN

RELIGION.

Publishing Committee:

ROBERT COLLYER, Chicago. WM. C. GANNETT, St. Paul.
JENKIN LL. JONES, Janesville. C. W. WENDTE, Cincinnati.
J. C. LEARNED, St. Louis.

PUBLISHED SEMI-MONTHLY AT 65 WASHINGTON ST., CHICAGO.
Per Year, $1.50. Single Number, 10 Cents.

FRANCES L. ROBERTS, 65 Washington St., Chicago, • Business Agent.
J. T. SUNDERLAND, 65 Washington St., Chicago, } Editors of
GEO. W. COOKE, Grand Haven, Mich., • } "Notes and News."

Editorial Contributors

Charles E. Beals
Harry Foster Burns
Charles W. Casson
George Willis Cooke
Percy M. Dawson
James Waldo Fawcett
Zona Gale
Emil G. Hirsch
Chester Lloyd Jones
David Starr Jordan
Frederick Starr
Jabez T. Sunderland
James H. West

Foreign Representatives

CANADA—Sidney Snow
ENGLAND—Fred Hankinson
E. D. Morel
Walter Walsh
FRANCE—Romain Rolland
INDIA—Rabindranath Tagore
RUSSIA—Alina Huebsch
(*To be enlarged*)

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter, January 12, 1899, at the Postoffice at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879"

UNITY Fellowship Associates

BOND OF UNION

We, the undersigned, believing in the association of all men and women who are in sympathy with the aims and ideals set forth in the Announcement on following page, do invite all who wish to co-operate to join in a world-wide fellowship that has no bounds of race or creed.

The name of this fellowship is The Unity Fellowship Associates and its purpose is the interpretation of the Religion of Democracy. Membership means a declaration of sympathy and interest. There are no dues. Members may make voluntary contributions which will be used for the purpose of making known the aims of the Fellowship and the publication of its literature.

UNITY will be the organ of this Fellowship and all members will be requested, though not compelled, to be subscribers.

Lists of the members will be sent to all members so that they may be known to one another. Local groups may be formed wherever there exists a sufficient number and there is the desire to do so.

All persons who desire to become members may do so by sending their names to UNITY, care of Abraham Lincoln Centre, Chicago, Ill.

Name .....

Address .....

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

To UNITY PUBLISHING COMPANY,
700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago.

Gentlemen:

Enclosed you will find check for which please enter my subscription to UNITY for one year.

Mr. (Mrs. or Miss)_____

Address _____

Rates: $3.00 ($3.50 in Canada; $4.00 in other countries) for a year's subscription. Single copies 10 cents.

Contents

EDITORIAL—

Notes 163
Facing the Facts in the Church Situation.—EDMUND H. REEMAN 165

ARTICLES—

100 Per Cent Americanism. A Medical Report.—JOHN HAYNES HOLMES 169
The Russian Tragedy.—BRENT DOW ALLINSON 172
Are We Humiliating Mexico?—CHESTER LLOYD JONES 173
"Democracy and World Relations" 174
Condensed from a Review by Friedrich Zimmermann of Jordan's "Democracy and World Relations."

CORRESPONDENCE—

An International Federation of Churches and Ministers for the Abolition of War.—CAROLIN B. TOWNER 174

THE FIELD—

Women's International League for Peace and Freedom 175

UNITY

"HE HATH MADE OF ONE ALL NATIONS OF MEN"

VOL. LXXXVIII. THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 24, 1921 NUMBER 11

RE-ARMAMENT.

Not all the armor forged by man, not all the weapons he has made for his defense, have saved him.

Ships and guns, poisonous fumes, deadly engines of the skies and the waters, have availed, for the moment, not to make the old world better, but to make the new world worse.

The incense of valor and sacrifice and death—all honor and reverence to the noble spirits who made these immortal offerings!—has risen from the altars, and not yet is the world re-born.

Therefore, it is that man, wounded, bleeding, burdened, staggering, fumbles at the buckles that bind the weight of his armor on his back, longing to cast it off, and wondering if they that take the sword must after all perish by the sword.

Shall he then throw away all his weapons of conquest and defense?

There is one armor that the world of men and women, as a world, has never put on. The churches have long bungled with its fastening, but the world has gone unaffected, and few have been those in whose hands the mystical sword of the spirit has shone with daily use.

This armor, waiting to be worn, is the armor of brotherhood and sacrifice, the sword of unselfishness, a conquering sword, with the power, when used, to unite the world in love. And there are none who may not put it on.

A dream of the poets? Yes. But there are dreams that come true. Even now the poet's voice is merged and drowned in the universal cry, Disarm. The prudent and fearful hold back, and ask, "Disarm, and stand defenseless?" The answer comes, to all a single answer, "Disarm and arm again, with a new armor, not yet tried."

The Boston Herald. —*M. A. DeWolfe Howe.*

Of nothing is the new and greater UNITY so proud as of the men who have consented to serve as its "foreign representatives." These are perhaps the happiest assurance we have of influence to match the work we hope to do. To the names already upon our list, representing Canada, England, India and Russia, we now have the great honor of adding the name of

ROMAIN ROLLAND,

of France, author of "Jean Christophe," "Above the Battle," "Clerambault" and other books of world-wide fame; during the war "the keeper of the European conscience"; today the supreme exemplar of freedom and fellowship among men. Like Tolstoy, of whom he is the great successor, Rolland is the outstanding spiritual leader of contemporary Europe. In a letter just received, he writes, "Bien volontiers, je vous donne mon nom pour votre magazine, UNITY, et je vous remercie de une l'avoir demandè. Si je puis, à l'occasion, vous envoyer quelque article, je le ferai avec plaisir." We would express herewith, on behalf of our readers as well as of ourselves, the honor we feel on receiving M. Rolland into our fellowship, and our gratitude as well for the assistance which he so generously proffers. May UNITY be worthy of the co-operation of so great a soul! It is interesting to note that, at just this time, there appears a biography of Romain Rolland, by Stefan Zweig, published by Thomas Seltzer. This is a noble work, worthy in every way of the man whose life-story it presents.

The Conference for the Limitation of Armaments has made a good beginning. President Harding's forthright declaration for "the outlawry of war," Secretary Hughes' proposal for the reduction of navies and the ten years' naval holiday, the publicity of these proposals, all combine to make the opening of this momentous assemblage an auspicious one. Written all over the face of these early proceedings is a confession of the approaching bankruptcy of the world, and the necessity therefore of doing something drastic to save society from disaster. The exigencies of the situation, in other words, are with us! Now it but remains to roll up such a tide of public sentiment for disarmament and the abolition of war that there will be added to economic necessity a passion of spiritual idealism which will wring more from the Conference than even the most optimistic among us had dared to hope. The most promising feature of the existing situation is the vast popular acclaim which is greeting the present movement for peace. The people are tired of war; they are ready for great achievement, for heroic enterprise. If so much enthusiasm has already been stirred by the administration program, how much greater enthusiasm still would greet and sustain more sweeping undertakings. Let present proposals be a minimum below which the Conference shall not be allowed to fall, and beyond which it may be encouraged—nay, clamorously commanded!—to go.

It is an amazing fact, an impressive tribute to the sheer power of ideas, that the most interesting aspect of the Conference for the Limitation of Armaments is the presence of Mr. H. G. Wells. This distinguished author, who has never held an official position in his life, is attracting more attention and wielding more influence as he sits on the threshold of the Conference than any one of all the statesmen who sit about its table. Furthermore he is joining issue with the purposes of America and the other powers, in a way to embarrass most seriously the presidents and premiers who have no such popular following as this quiet

novelist. Already, before real deliberations have begun, he has revealed a condition of world-collapse which makes the discussion of any such subsidiary and accidental topic as disarmament ridiculous. He has warned the conferees that if they are not prepared to get rid of armies and navies altogether, and establish forthwith a universal super-government of the world, it would be better if they had never come together at all. He has proclaimed that the Versailles Treaty must be denounced as the beginning of any real accomplishment; and that the exclusion of Germany and Russia makes anything that the Conference may do of little or none effect. That Mr. Wells is threatening to "spill the beans," is obvious enough. If this sort of thing goes on, day after day, what becomes of the nice little plans already laid for a reduction of armaments and a temporary settlement of most points in the Pacific, to enable the world to hold together long enough to get decently ready for the next war? Mr. Wells may actually stir up the people to such a degree that they may actually refuse to be fooled. Which would be a pretty piece of business, indeed!

So the Nobel Prize Commission has decided to award its honors for literature, in 1921, to Anatole France! A few weeks ago it was solemnly announced that this would not be done, for the reason that the great French author was a Communist. This was either a false report, or else the Commission in a belated moment of inspiration came to recognize that political and economic opinion has nothing to do with literary achievement. In any case, the awarding of the Nobel Prize to France does honor quite as much to them who give as to him who receives. Anatole France has for two generations been one of the leading writers of his native land, and has in recent years stood easily among the great literary figures of the world. Some of his writings have already entered so deeply into the consciousness of the race, as to give them, while their author is still living, the atmosphere of classics. Furthermore the gentle and ironic note of cynicism, which characterizes so many of his books, does not corrode but only adds piquancy and point to the essential idealism which underlies them all. France's adherence to Communism in his old age is one of the most amazing biographical facts of modern times. It is not so much an acceptance of this particular school of thought, we must believe, as a dramatic rejection of the society which produced the tragic futilities of the Great War and after. Even so, it is an act of courage and faith almost unexampled in one of his age, station and great fame.

In the Boston *Herald* appears the following significant editorial:

Why This Severity?

How many readers, as they see the small announcement in the corner of the newspaper that a girl propagandist is to be deported realize what this means?

Ponzi, who had taken millions of dollars from the trusting poor, received five years in prison for his calculated villainy. This girl, Molly Steimer, received in 1918, at the age of 18 a sentence in a federal court of 15 years for "distributing circulars denouncing the United States government for sending troops to Russia to oppose the soviet government."

But a Russian girl, of school age, presumably knowing little of our laws or of the dangerous consequences of defying the prevailing hysteria, dared to distribute a protest against the government, written by someone else—a wild and foolish circular, no doubt. To-day, after a term in prison, she is to be deported to the land of starvation as an act of grace.

Can we afford to let her accusing voice leave our shores without a word of sympathy or help or pardon? Do we care and have we any realization of what a travesty on justice she may tell to millions who had looked to our free land as the world's hope?

We count this an evidence of returning sanity in America. We cannot agree that Molly Steimer's circular protesting against making war upon Russia without the sanction of Congress, was "a wild and foolish circular, no doubt," except from the standpoint of individual personal safety. Nobody thought that the protest of the mothers of boys in Siberia, which came a little later, was "wild and foolish." Those who have read "Fighting Without a War," by Ralph Albertson, Y. M. C. A. officer with the American troops in northern Russia, do not believe that the protests of the soldiers were "wild and foolish." But this point is unimportant; it is only a last lingering survival of war madness. The important thing is that here is evidence that all sense of justice and decency is not yet lost in America.

Every now and then somebody rises up and calls us pessimistic. Now usually we don't like this accusation a little bit, for we think we have a good hope of humankind. On occasion, however, we accept the impeachment with good grace—nay, even with eagerness and everlasting joy. One such occasion came last week when we received in the mail a little pamphlet labeled "Nuggets," containing some gems of wisdom from the mind of Postmaster-General Will H. Hayes. We have a great respect for Mr. Hayes, by the way, as an administrator. He is not only an inexpressible relief from Mr. Burleson, but an admirable executive in his own right. As a philosopher, however, he is "something different again," to quote our old friend Perlmutter. Take these aforesaid gems, for example! "Everywhere, everywhere," ululates the ecstatic Mr. Hayes, "is the spirit of America; everywhere, everywhere is the manhood and womanhood of this republic. Everywhere are the churches, everywhere the schoolhouses; everywhere the fathers and mothers walking to worship, with the children running ahead with their little starched dresses and pink

ribbons; everywhere the same look ahead . . . all reaching upward, upward to the same God. . . . All good, all ahead, all up, and up and up. I tell you it is a great, great country. . . . It will be all right. No exigency, however serious, will present to this nation an unsurmountable obstacle. Every problem is solvable. This nation is a success." Lovely, lovely, and no mistake! Exquisitely lovely! But what does it mean? What is it worth? How near is it to the facts? What does it do to solve problems that are "solvable"? We would not be an incorrigible cynic, by any means; but this at least we must confess—that we find it almost impossible to stomach this soufflé stuff. If this is optimism, give us pessimism!

"The cry is, Still they come!" This at least is UNITY's cry, as it surveys the books that tell the truth about the war. The latest to be noted, and earnestly commended to our readers is John Dos Passos's great novel, "Three Soldiers." We do not wonder that the militarists and the reactionary press are going into paroxysms of dismay and denunciation over this book. With a realism that is comparable to nothing that has been seen since Barbusse's "Under Fire," Dos Passos reveals the facts about the conscript army that we trained and sent to France in 1917 and 1918. In the concrete instances of three young men of different types, he shows what the military machine does with the raw material which is fed to it. Soldiers have told us that only a portion of the truth about army life is set forth in this novel, for the simple reason that the whole truth is so filthy that it is unprintable. But enough is told to make one's soul cringe in horror, as one's body cringes when it touches vermin. That some men went through this experience without being ruined, as the heroes of this book were ruined, is true. It is also true that some men go through a scourge of cholera without dying—but cholera is still a scourge. That this sort of thing is inevitable under war conditions, may also be true. But this only constitutes additional proof that "war is hell," and as fatal to ourselves as to the enemy. Read "Three Soldiers," and get your friends to read it!

Is it true that there are churches which had rather die miserably in stubborn denial of all spiritual progress, than to live happily and usefully in acceptance of sweeping change? It is! We know of many such churches; and strangely enough, churches liberal (so-called) as well as orthodox. We have in mind at this moment one such church—an institution located in a large city, made famous by a noble history. The people of this church are today held together and animated by a single passion—that of guarding their sacred shrine from the defilement of a wicked world. They are so busy cherishing their history in the past, that they have no time to make any new history at the present moment. Wedded to their denominational idols, they expell with horror from their sanctuary every word which is not in dead conformity with the ideas transmitted to them by the fathers who founded, as pioneers, their sect. Smugly respectable in the things of this world, these people look complacently upon empty pews which, if filled by accident by the multitudes, they would promptly cleanse and fumigate. This church has for years been dying; and by some strange perversity of spirit, this very fact of death is taken as proof positive of righteousness and truth. It is a peaceful place—but so is a cemetery. It will be maintained for years to come, like a mausoleum, by money. But its usefulness to living men is exactly that of a grave-stone.

Facing the Facts in the Church Situation

No fact of contemporary life is plainer than that church-going is a declining habit among the American people. It did not need the staggering estimate that sixty-five millions of people in America are without church connections to impress this fact upon keen observers.

Wherever one has gone within recent years it has been the altogether unusual exception to find a well filled church. Nor are there any important comparisons to be drawn between churches in this respect. It would serve greatly, indeed, to simplify the problem involved if it could be said that significant comparisons did exist in this matter; if, for example, we could say that liberal churches are well filled and that only orthodox churches show a declining attendance, or vice versa. But this cannot be said. The size of the average congregation in a liberal church in this country on any given Sunday affords no basis for believing that the liberal churches are meeting this problem in any more effective way than the orthodox churches. Proportionately to the number of their adherents, or to their appeal to the general public, there is little to choose between the two groups. To find fifty per cent of the enrolled membership of any church in its pews upon any ordinary Sunday would be a pleasing experience to our ministers.

Instinctively the question rises in the serious mind —What are we going to do about it? That it is disturbing is to say the least, nor can even the partial success of denominational drives for money quiet the insistent conviction that the facts in question involve grave problems that challenge our courage to face them. The revival of interest in churches which many people believed would follow the Great War has proved a forlorn hope and the situation as it stands to-day is, if anything, worse than before the war. Neither revivalism among the orthodox churches, nor the special efforts of liberal churches are greatly improving the

situation. Obviously there are reasons that explain the situation if only we can get down to them. The trouble, perhaps, is that until now a good many of us have been more concerned to convince ourselves that things are not as bad as they might seem than we have been to accept the facts at their face value and try to get down to the real reasons that account for them. Perhaps, in some cases the feeling that any frank recognition of the facts might involve radical readjustments in practices dear to us by long association if the situation is to be fairly met may have acted as a deterrent.

It would, of course, be presumptuous for any one person to claim that he sees all that is involved or has any complete panacea for the condition existing. I write simply as one who has a profound interest in the problem of religion and life and with more than fifteen years' experience in the ministry of religion in England and America to draw upon. Facing the situation in the light of this experience and probing deeply into it in search of possible explanations for the declining interest in church attendance, I find myself giving more and more weight to three or four main factors that seem to relate to it.

In the first place, it seems unquestionable that there of the general public to church-going and the growing is a very definite connection between the indifference modern dissatisfaction with conventional theological dogmas and their basic philosophy of life. It is to-day past cavil that there is a radical antagonism between the dominant tendencies and principles governing contemporary American thought and the fundamental assumptions upon which a large part of Christian theology is built. Not only is it true that the developments of modern knowledge have established principles that strike at the very heart of the principles of conventional theology, and present findings that are in direct contradiction to many long cherished dogmas, but it is also true that the standards of authority long assumed in theology and ecclesiastical polity are in direct contravention of the essential principles of democratic aspiration and idealism. In other words, it is undoubtedly true that a large number of people no longer attend church services because they can no longer accept the kind of teaching and the body of doctrines that are characteristic of the ordinary churches, and are utterly out of sympathy with the pedagogical methods employed in church pulpits and church schools.

Important as this consideration is, however, I do not believe that it by any means explains the whole problem of declining church attendance. Indeed, I should be inclined to say that at most it affects only a comparatively small percentage of our estimated 65 millions of non-churchgoers in any direct way. The people who bring a rational intelligence to bear upon the problems of religious thought are after all only a small minority among the great masses of the unchurched.

A somewhat more important fact, at least as operating in the case of a larger number, has to do, I believe, with what may be called in plain terms the cant, hypocrisy and narrow sectarianism of the divided churches of Christendom. This statement is not intended as any reflection upon the generous-hearted and whole-souled men and women who are to be found in churches of all creeds. That there are many such who are literally "the salt of the earth" my own experience abundantly confirms. Nevertheless, the fact remains that rightly or wrongly, church-going is identified in many minds with an hypocrisy and cant that is positively repellent. The old artificial distinctions drawn by evangelical churches between the morality of the "saved" man and the natural goodness of the "unsaved" person have resulted in a sickening confusion of cant and humbug. Everybody to-day knows that there is very little distinction to be drawn between the general morality of the average group of American citizens, whether inside or outside of the churches. Decent people are decent people wherever we find them, and the old idea that the so-called "saved" man is put in the way of attaining a higher righteousness of life than his "unsaved" fellowman simply is not borne out by the facts of human experience. The average church-goer does not rank morally higher than any other decent citizen, and people know it. That people may have been taught to expect a higher morality of the churchman is often in the circumstances of modern life a distinct disadvantage to the churches, especially since there are sometimes cases where church people do not always measure up to even conventional standards. A good many people, I find, labor to-day under the unfortunate feeling that there is a whole lot of cant and humbug about the practices and ideals of morality supposed to prevail in churches. Nor are they altogether without justification. No one can come into close touch with the organizations of religion without very soon discovering that wire-pulling, jealousy and rivalry, often even among the ministers of religion, are as prevalent as in any other organization of men and women. While in numerous cases, in some doubtless because of actual penury, and in others because of a total lack of business principles and business efficiency, the credit rating of churches in any financial handbook leaves much to be desired.

Add to this the conviction, particularly dominant among the forces of organized labor, that in a majority of cases a minister of religion is a paid hireling pledged to defend but one side of a case, and often an actual accomplice of forces of conservatism and re-action, and you have a state of mind that cannot but react unfavorably alike to church attendance and to church influence. Nor can one afford to discount

in any attempt to face this problem the deep-rooted impatience of the modern mind with the petty squabbles and sectarian issues that have often marked church activity. Almost every day one runs into people who tell you that there are too many churches by far and that they can see no reason for the old denominational lines of demarcation, especially where, as so often, they operate to bring about costly duplication of effort. Whether baptism shall be by immersion or by sprinkling, whether ecclesiastical polity shall be dominated by standards of episcopal rule, or by simple congregational principles may be important questions for rival churchmen, but they do not come home to the consciousness of the average man outside the churches with any of the force of a vital issue. On the contrary the average man is inclined to argue that if the churches really meant business they would have shelved these matters long ago. Not that the average man is strong for church union, as churchmen understand that term. His attitude is rather expressed in the blunt common saying, "They're all driving at the same thing, aren't they? Then why don't they get down to business and stop squabbling and calling names?" Now there may be good reasons for denominational differences that are plain to a studious mind, but in the case of the man who takes things as he finds them in the world at large these differences very easily operate to create an unsympathetic attitude to all denominational churches.

I am inclined, however, to think that a third factor operates on a vastly wider scale than either of these afore-mentioned factors. People haven't stopped going to church simply because they are all alienated by the slowness of theological teachers to adapt their teachings to the new sanctions of modern thought, or because they are all deterred by the cant and hypocrisy of sectarian squabbles. By far the greater majority are absent because they have no interest in churches or in what they stand for. It is surely no straining of the facts to say that a widespread religious indifference is at the very foundation of the present situation. I am not condemning the American people for this indifference, nor am I raising the point in order to excuse the churches for their share of responsibility for this indifference. I am merely remarking upon it and accepting it as a factor in the situation. It is no use to juggle facts, they are what they are. And to me it seems obvious that the present age is not a religious age. If people really wanted to go to church, they would go. Where they do not go it is largely because they are not interested in going. They would rather do other things. I even know professing church people who are more frequently to be found on the golf links Sunday morning than in the church pew. Nobody is driving people in these matters. They are pleasing themselves. They would rather play golf, take an auto trip, go to the movies or the theatre than they would go to church. They are indifferent, in short, to the whole religious proposition. In numerous cases within my observation it never comes near their vital interests except perhaps when a death occurs in the family and they think that decency requires the employment of a clergyman at the funeral service.

What most people are seeking to-day is a "jolly good time," Sundays as much as any other day, and as a rule they do not find that church-going fits into their idea of a jolly good time. People can find all the sociability they want without going to church. The only thing, indeed, they can't find is the inspiration of worship and consecrated collective devotion to a great ideal, and in this they are not at the moment greatly interested. The average business man to-day does not find prayer a necessity of his business, and when he's through with business he would rather play than pray. Is it not so? And it is very much the same with multitudes of our young people—their interests are about equally divided (sometimes very unequally divided) between work or study and play or pleasure. Look at the way many of our young girls, children of decent parents, get themselves up to parade the streets of our larger cities by the hundred, hours after they ought to be in bed, in garments that a chorus girl might have hesitated to wear a dozen years ago. It's the fashion? Of course it is, but what are fashions but the reflection of a state of mind?

The newspapers of a country are a pretty good index of the mind of the public. Glance through the pages of a typical daily or Sunday newspaper and you will see at once how small a place the churches hold in the public interest as the newspaperman judges it. Whole pages of print will be given up to sport, to news of the movies and theatres, to sensational and often mushy stories of a thousand and one things to any one single paragraph of religious news you will find. There isn't a preacher in the whole of America to-day who comes within a mile of Douglas Fairbanks, Mary Pickford, or Charlie Chaplin from the standpoint of contemporary news values.

Again I say I am not condemning the American public, those things are so. I am merely remarking upon them as facts too obvious to evade. It is not for anyone to condemn, least of all the churches. And I am prepared to recognize another fact, as it seems to me, namely, that never again can church-going be restored to the old status or follow the old lines. For centuries the churches enjoyed a Sunday monopoly. To-day they are in open competition with every interest that can appeal to the human mind. The change that has come about is not a mere temporary re-action. No amount of special pleading and conventional revivalism can possibly affect it. It is futile to look for any such thing as a widespread revival of religious interest along the old lines. The business of religion

is going to be a different thing from what it has been in the past and, incidentally, it is going to be *much more of a business,* if one may judge from present signs and tendencies.

It seems to me that if the churches are going to amount to anything in the future they have simply got to "sell" their proposition in the open market and alongside of every other competing interest that to-day makes its bid for human attention. For the life of me I can't see that any other course is open to us, nor am I greatly perturbed by the conviction. As a minister of religion, in fact it rather appeals to me. There is something fascinating about the thought of salesmanship as applied to religion. At least it puts a man upon his mettle to feel that it's up to him to go out and sell his goods on the basis of their sheer merit. It is the salesman's business to create demand where no demand exists, and if the public to-day shows no great interest in what the churches have to offer then there is a real chance for preachers and church officers to show the quality of their salesmanship.

After all there is nothing very stimulating about the success of a church that derives its success from the force of the church-going habit and the old traditions of the responsibility of church attendance. I would infinitely rather have a church that was able to hold its own in the face of the full competition of a wide open Sunday than one that was thronged with people whose chief reason for attending was that there was nothing else to do. I should feel that it had some right to be and that it really did count for something. And this carries us to the very heart of the real problem. Have the churches anything to offer that men really need, or anything to the need of which men can be wakened even though they may be unconscious of the need at the moment? In short, what real merchandise have the churches to market? At least one reason why some churches are losing out to-day is found in the fact that they themselves are not sure what they are driving at. If we really have "something to sell" then the chief problem confronting us in the unchurched millions of America is the problem of "putting the thing across." In other words, it is mainly a question of methods adapted to modern times.

And this brings me to the main point I wish to make, namely, the advisibility, even the necessity, of a thorough change of method in church activity. This is pre-eminently a day of big things. Thus far church activity, at least among our Protestant churches, has been pretty much a matter of petty affairs. The basic idea governing church methods now these many years, namely to take the church to the people instead of bringing people to the church, is, I believe open to grave criticism and has largely tended to magnify the day of small things. Go into an American city of size and you will find the main theatres and movies, the leading hotels, the prominent office buildings and important banks all in close proximity. It is this congregation of business and business buildings, indeed, that makes the modern city. Every business man to-day recognizes that it is more important to him to be where people go than to go where people live. Instinctively he wants to be near the point where the greatest number of people collect. But with our churches it is just the opposite. You find, do you not, that the policy for years now has been to abandon the downtown site, often extraordinarily valuable, in favor of the suburban or residential site, with the result that it is the hardest thing in the world in many cities to find a single church in the business section; with the more significant result yet that even the larger denominational enterprises will be found broken up into segments and scattered broadcast throughout a wide area. It seems to be the idea that the man or woman who will go downtown any day in the week to buy a pair of shoes, or to attend a movie show, will not go downtown in order to attend a church service. In other words, the conventional policy in church affairs has been largely the policy of the corner grocery store, and what has the corner grocery store ever amounted to? It sometimes makes a passable living for the recent Italian emigrant, but it does not and it cannot attract big business. And this policy of activity in church affairs has resulted in a pettiness of effort that in itself would go far to explain the public indifference. I know cities where one can find as many as eight or nine churches of the same denominational order scattered throughout its residential districts. What does it mean? It means in practical terms, first, an enormous aggregate capital investment in lands and church properties; second, an enormous aggregate annual expenditure for maintenance, upkeep and operation; third, an ever present struggle on the part of split-up groups to compete with one another and to maintain costly operation. It commonly results, furthermore, and this is a strong indictment against it, in our pulpits being manned with poorly-paid and consequently often mediocre men, who are frequently no bigger than their parishes. At the very best it makes a jack-of-all-trades of multitudes of our ministers, placing upon them burdens of detail and responsibility that are alone enough to destroy the pulpit efficiency of any but the most extraordinary men.

Imagine any responsible business executive trying to run a really important business on lines of broad vision and far-reaching policy with himself as his own stenographer, salesman, business-getter, office-boy and even upon occasion his own janitor.

Has not the time come for a radical departure from these older methods and for new and daring experiments in other methods and policies? If the churches have anything to offer that men really need, if religion actually does represent a vital interest in human

affairs, then the proposition can be "sold," providing only we have the right kind of salesmen and go the right way about it. Can anyone doubt the difference it would make in the influence of religion upon a community if the eight or nine denominational churches of the same order that we now commonly find in our larger cities could combine to build a really imposing institution in the heart of the city, equipped and manned for really efficient religious activity. And how much more effective might the appeal of such an institution be if, ignoring all dead denominational issues, and organizing upon the basis of practical human service, it could associate and unite with itself all those, of every creed and class, who have the moral welfare and spiritual vision of the community, and the advancement of human well-being at heart in one great and commanding spiritual enterprise.

EDMUND H. REEMAN.

100 Per Cent Americanism

A MEDICAL REPORT

I.

Is it not time that the phenomenon of "100 per cent Americanism" should be recognized for what it is—a dangerous form of contagious disease, a pestilence? Its manifestations in Lusk Committees, Civic Federations, Manufacturers' Associations, American Legions, Ku Klux Klans, are numerous. Its area of activity is wider than that of the influenza scourge of three years ago, and its violence more terrible. Its mortality rate is as yet undetermined; but a peculiarly alarming feature is the frequent lapsing of its victims into incurable insanity. That such a disease should so long pass unrecognized is perhaps no more strange than that many similar diseases in the past, especially those presenting grotesque phases of mental unbalance, should have worked their ravages for years without detection. Less explicable, and certainly less creditable, is the tendency in some quarters, now that the disease is being uncovered, to take pride in falling victim to its contagion as men used to take pride in getting drunk. Most amazing of all, at least in this age of so-called reason and enlightenment, is the attempt to clothe those stricken with the scourge with the dignity and authority of religion, after the pattern of the medicine men of the North American Indians, the witch doctors of Central Africa, and the whirling dervishes of the Far East. All such reactions to this phenomenon should long since have come to an end. The "100 per cent Americanism," of which we hear so much, is a disease as contagious as yellow fever, as dangerous to its victims as paranoia. It must therefore be studied to the end of wiping it out by every means at our disposal.

II

We are fortunate in knowing that "100 per cent Americanism" is a germ disease, but unfortunate in not having succeeded as yet in identifying and isolating the germ. The bacillus, however, is plainly very old, having flourished persistently in the tribal stages of man's existence. Indeed the disease, under various names, seems to have been practically universal in those early days, as measles and chickenpox are universal for children today. As conditions changed, however, and nations came to take the place of tribes and city-states, the disease gradually subsided through long intervals of time, or at least expressed itself in mild and harmless ways. War, however, seems to provide ideal conditions for its recurrence, for immediately upon a declaration of hostilities, the pestilence is upon us! This is what happened in the United States in 1917. A month had not passed after our entrance into the Great War, before the disease appeared and spread throughout the country with astounding rapidity. It raged unabated for a year and a half, until Armistice Day in 1918, when little by little it began to subside; only to break out afresh, however, in 1919 and 1920. In this later form it was characterized by a strange eruptive or explosive form which made it appear with startling suddenness and virulence in isolated spots, as in the New York Legislature in the spring of 1920. In recent months the disease has taken on a certain more quiet but chronic form which is peculiarly baffling.

Persons subject to visitations of "100 per cent Americanism," in either its earlier or later forms, comprise a large majority of the population of the country. Only occasional individuals, here and there, seem to be immune. Certain distinct groups, however, have proved to be especially liable to attack. Among these may be named the "400" set of every city and town, Chambers of Commerce, Manufacturers' Associations, Women's Clubs, Sons and Daughters of the American Revolution, the Union League Club of New York, etc. Indeed, "100 per cent Americanism" seems to be a disease of the well-to-do and socially respectable, as tuberculosis is prevailingly a disease of the poor. The great body of the middle class, however, are by no means spared. The small communities of the Middle West, for instance, which seemed for a time in 1917 to be escaping the scourge, were all at once caught as by a prairie fire, and promptly devoured. Like the influenza, which it will be remembered seized upon the young and strong for its victims, this scourge spread for a time most rapidly in quarters where it would least be expected to enter. Thus it raged in colleges, with disastrous consequences for the rising generation. It flared up terribly in the churches, which became for a while the most dangerous centers of contagion. It even made its appearance in theatres, opera houses, symphony halls and other centers of art and culture, and wrought damage of an irreparable character. A trying feature of the pestilence was the deliberate organization, by men and women who thought the disease was a new religion, of societies like the National Security League, for its dissemination among the people. These societies are the real forerunners of the new type of "germ warfare," which we are told is to be so conspicuous a method of waging hostilities in the next great conflict between the nations. An alarming feature was the discovery of "carriers"—men, that is, whose physical systems produced and distributed germs of "100 per cent Americanism," as the famous "Typhoid Mary" was some years ago found to be unconsciously producing and distributing germs of typhoid

fever. In the case of one of these "carriers," an astonishing subsidence of the disease was effected by a chance application of Tiffany silver. It is doubtful, however, if the abnormal condition was really cured.

III.

What takes place in the individual organism, when infected with the disease of "100 per cent Americanism," is not yet accurately determined. Such investigations as have been conducted indicate pretty clearly that two antithetical and yet complementary processes are set in motion—on the one hand, softening of the brain, and on the other hand, hardening of the heart. If the inward phenomena of the contagion are uncertain, however, the outward symptoms are perfectly clear and definite.

Fever is the initial symptom. The patient develops very promptly a high temperature. One hundred degrees is reached almost at once—indeed, the name of the disease, "100 per cent Americanism," is probably derived from this fact of the instant rise of temperature to this point. It is seldom, however, that the fever stops here; as a rule it mounts rapidly to amazing figures. Certain definite stages of mental reaction then become apparent. At once there comes an extraordinary degree of excitement. The patient seems to be unable to be calm, or to enjoy repose. He begins to lose sleep and in his waking hours to give way to frequent entreats of anger! He is easily annoyed or fretted. Little things, like headlines in the newspaper, stir him to inordinate expressions of feeling. He cannot hear a speech or read a pamphlet in an unfamiliar tongue, or expressing ideas contrary to his own, without a paroxysm of emotion. He rapidly becomes childish, in the sense that he must be constantly petted and indulged. If opposed during this condition of fever, the patient is liable to become hysterical, and pass quite beyond the bounds of rationality. This state is temporary; it either subsides as the result of a fall of temperature, or else passes over into incurable insanity.

A second symptom or condition is delirium. The patient, who has hitherto been a sensible man, seems now to lose all sense of reality. He moves out of the world of actual experience into a realm of shadows. All ordinary standards of judgment seem to disappear from his mind; he is unable to distinguish truth from falsehood. The most patent lies are calmly accepted as facts. Hallucinations are frequent. A distinct condition of fear sets in. The patient suddenly becomes terrified at prospects of invasion, riots, bloodshed and revolution. He begins to hear bombs and explosions, see marching armies and vast uprisings of the people. He cannot see a gathering in a hall or in the street without suspecting a conspiracy against the state. He is beset by "bogey-men" like a child in the dark. The single color "red" becomes a kind of mania. It is to be noted that this symptom exposes the invalid to the danger of propaganda. In this state of mind he can be persuaded to anything that any quack practitioner is unscrupulous enough to "put over" on him. Physicians are particularly warned against this peril.

A third symptom is megalomania. The patient becomes greatly impressed with a sense of his own importance. What he thinks becomes the standard for every other mind; what he does, the pattern for every other life. In this stage of the disease, the patient seems to become utterly incapable of recognizing that anybody is to be considered, or is of any importance, but himself. He identifies himself with the nation, with civilization, with humanity, with God. He develops a perfect case of the mania of possession. He believes, for example, that America belongs to him, as his house, his automobile, or his jewels belong to him. This country is his private property, to be shared with other persons or not as he sees fit, and on such terms as he may determine to exact. The appropriation of public schools, for example,—the refusal of their use to any citizens but those whom he is pleased to sanctify with his approval,—is a very common indication of the presence of the disease. Along with the mania of possession must be noted an apparently contradictory impulse of generosity. Thus the patient, who insists on reserving to himself such rights as those of free speech and free assembly, is overwhelmingly zealous in bestowing upon others the right to enlist in the army, to buy Liberty Bonds, etc. He has even been known to force these privileges on people, whether they want them or not. This unwonted generosity would seem to be an inconsistent expression of the disease, but at bottom it is a phase, however distorted, of this same symptom of megalomania.

Lastly, as a symptom of "100 per cent Americanism," is a peculiarly ugly form of intolerance. The patient now becomes bitter, vindictive, hateful. He denounces those who speak a different language, hold different ideas, seek different ideals, from himself. Citizens of foreign nations are especially the objects of his venom. It is probable that this stage of the disease is accompanied by an inward blackening of the liver. At any rate, the victim becomes impossible to live with. He is fit for the company of none but those who are afflicted with the same contagion, and therefore should be promptly removed to a pest-house. Headquarters of American Legions and Ku Klux Klans might well be used for this purpose. A common expression of this symptom of intolerance is the calling of names and the dissemination of slanders. The patient now finds his chief delight in hurling all kinds of foul and indecent epithets upon those whom he does not like. The calling of names is the one thing which can give the victim of "100 per cent Americanism" some fleeting repose. To call a name seems to be equivalent, with him, to settling a problem of the universe. More dangerous, as an expression of intolerance, is the persecution mania. If the patient is very ill, he is not content to hurl epithets. He must not merely revile, but punish. It is this which explains the espionage laws, the raids, deportations, and imprisonments, which have made America in recent years a tsaristic Russia. "100 per cent Americanism" has simply spread to the seats of power, and there worked its will on those who exercise authority.

Such are the leading symptoms of this disease. That there are physical accompaniments of these symptoms would seem to be evident, as we have said! Such phenomena cannot exist apart from softening of the brain and hardening of the heart. At bottom, however, the ailment is essentially spiritual. It is a form of madness, even in its earliest and simplest stages. The fact that, if not promptly stayed, it develops into some phase of insanity, would seem to lend finality to this diagnosis.

IV.

The full significance of "100 per cent Americanism," however, cannot properly be understood save from the

standpoint of the hypothesis, hinted at above, that this disease is only the most recent expression of a phenomenon as old as the race itself. It would seem to be a malady not of any one race or age, but of "human flesh" itself. Thus today, in spite of its local name, it is certainly not confined to America. The same symptoms, revealing the presence of the same ailment, have been present in Prussia for more than a generation past, and were only eradicated therefrom by the War. Indeed, the sequence of events would seem to lend color to the argument that the Prussian malady was not so much "purged away" from Prussia by the War, as transmitted to America, where its unfamiliar presence made its recognition difficult, and its baptism with a new title inevitable.

As to previous periods of history, it is not at all difficult to identify successive appearances of the disease. There was unquestionably an epidemic in this country in the days of slavery, when to denounce slavery and cry for freedom was to be described as an enemy of government. It raged furiously in England when the Pilgrims and Puritans fled across the seas for refuge. Thus James I must have been terribly sick of the disease, whatever it was called at that time, when he exclaimed of our New England fathers that they would either "conform" or he would "harry them out of the land." Of course, he was a king; and a king may still be healthy and say such things. But the fury of the declaration would seem to indicate that His Royal Majesty was grievously ill of the plague. The worst visitation of this pestilence, however, was in the Middle Ages, and is known by its own peculiar name, the Inquisition, as that other pestilence, the Black Death, is similarly known. In this awful period, "100 per cent Americanism"—to adopt the modern name—seized upon the priests of the church with a virulence unknown either before or since. So terrible was the plague that delirium straightway became insanity, and intolerance a cruelty of the worst description. Of course, such fires soon burned themselves out; but the germs of the disease still lived, to reappear and plague America in this late day.

V.

Of the cure of "100 per cent Americanism," nothing positive can yet be said. The disease still baffles the best medical knowledge, and it is not improbable that it will ultimately be conquered only by an immunity won through long and bitter experience. Certain suggestions, however, can be given.

First of all, there is the fresh air cure, as effective in this case as in the case of tuberculosis and pneumonia. Patients should be rigorously advised to keep their minds open. Every door and window should be flung wide, that there may be a constant circulation of free air from the outer world. Of course, the breezes from afar may bring germs of other and serious afflictions; but it is certain that no one of these can be so fatal as the germs that fester into life in the dark and poisoned atmosphere of a tight-closed mind. Whittier knew the laws of therapeutics, when he wrote in his "My Psalm," that

> . . . so the shadows fall apart,
> And so the west winds play,
> And all the windows of the heart
> I open to the day.

Secondly, patients should take vigorous heart exercises, to the end of keeping its tissues soft and flexible, and especially of enlarging its activity. We are persuaded that the one thing which renders the average man or woman most susceptible to the scourge of "100 per cent Americanism" is inactivity of the heart. To let this important organ lie idle is to let it harden and contract, and when this process reaches a certain stage, the "100 per cent Americanism" germ has found just the soil it needs for its propagation. To exercise the heart regularly and vigorously, therefore, is a matter of the first importance. This means acquaintanceship with people, association with the crowd, belief in the common man, and a development of personal affection for individuals. It means walking the streets, joining the throngs of workers, gaining and keeping the common touch. Exercise in this case is impossible if any aloofness is maintained. Nothing but fellowship, democracy, can do the business.

Again, patients should be put on a careful and regular diet. Details of such diet must be determined in part by the symptoms revealed in each individual case. Certain stable articles of food, however, may be recommended as well adapted to the needs of all persons afflicted. We would always use, for example, the Synoptic Gospels, John Milton's "Areopagitica," John Stuart Mill's "Liberty," John Morley's "Compromise," the Declaration of Independence and the United States Constitution, Jefferson's inaugural addresses and state papers, Abraham Lincoln's writings and addresses, especially his first inaugural, Theodore Parker's addresses and sermons on the Mexican War, Emerson's Essays, Thoreau's "Duty of Civil Disobedience," Tolstoy's "Bethink Yourselves," and Woodrow Wilson's "The New Freedom." Prescribe these for the patient, with Bacon's dietary directions that they be not merely "tasted," or "swallowed," but "chewed and digested"; and encouraging results in all but the worst cases of infection may be expected to ensue.

Lastly, there should be administered to all patients a good dose of religion. By religion, of course, we do not mean the concoctions which are merchandised by the churches, under various more or less familiar sectarian brands. On the contrary, we have in mind those pure, unadulterated "waters" of the spirit, which are to be had "without money and without price." Men are thirsting for these "healing streams," without knowing it. Persuade them to come and drink, and behold, they will be made whole again.

To be remembered always is the truth that men are at bottom sound. Health, not disease, is the normal state of life. In such condition, even the worst pestilences come only to go again. This wretched plague, "100 per cent Americanism," is working endless mischief in the world, but it may be conquered, and that speedily, if we keep cool heads and stout hearts.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

"In his life he was a great American. He is an American no longer. He is one of those giant figures, of whom there are very few in history, who lose their nationality in death. They are no longer Greek or Hebrew or English or American—they belong to mankind. I wonder whether I will be forgiven for saying that George Washington was a great American, but Abraham Lincoln belongs to the common people of every land."—*Lloyd George.*

(*At the unveiling of the Lincoln statue near Westminster Abbey in August,* 1920.)

The Russian Tragedy

The tales of horror coming out of Russia are seemingly endless. The country from which has come some of the greatest literature and music and science of all time, the country of Puskin and Dostojevsky, Tolstoy and Czekov, Gogol and Gorki, Kropotkin and Tschaikowsky and Metchinikoff, to whose creative originality and heroic labors the civilized world owes an immeasurable debt of gratitude,—against that country, the hand of God himself seems to have been lifted and Russia is to-day confronted with famine and pestilence and the grey reaping of Death throughout its richest provinces after seven years of almost continuous war and social upheaval, marked on the one hand by the most incredible savagery and on the other by the most amazing and self-sacrificing idealism of contemporary history.

I have talked recently with a German gentleman in one of the offices of the American Friends' Service Committee, which is feeding hundreds of thousands of hungry children throughout the Republic. A war prisoner of the Russians, he was at first confined and later employed in a village far from the railroad on the eastern border of European Russia. Still later he was placed in charge of prison work and relief work conducted by one of the neutral consulates. While there he was witness of a military engagement between the troops of General Kolchak and the Bolsheviki near Omsk. He has recently returned and although he will reveal only part of what he saw, that part is as terrible as some of the gory legends of Genghiz Kahn who once flourished in the district.

The Kolchak forces, directly or indirectly supported by the allied and associated governments, were attacking on a long front and were almost everywhere successful. The Bolsheviki were retreating and trains arriving in Omsk were loaded with Bolshevik prisoners. It was in the treatment of these prisoners that Kolchak's cruelty reached its height. They were starved and tortured and confined in vile jails and prison camps, where they died of disease by thousands. To the personal knowledge of my informant a group of about 100 Bolshevist prisoners were confined one winter night in a box-car. With the temperature about twenty degrees below zero, they were not merely confined there, but, with the knowledge, if not at the direct order of the officer in command, they were stripped of their clothing and abandoned throughout the night. In the morning the frozen corpses were chopped apart with axes and buried. It was the use of methods such as these which doubtless accounted in some measure for the cynical indifference and distrust which the Russian people exhibited towards the proclaimed "moral aims" of the war, of the Allies and of President Wilson.

And now Death stalks through Russia in a new form invited by a vast natural catastrophe rather than by the wilful depravity of men. Famine and drought have seized the Volga valley which was the greatest granary of Russia and of Europe for many years and great populations are on the march going they know not where in search of food. Almost the first woman investigator to penetrate into this region of death is a worker of the Quakers, who has just come out of Russia with her report graphic and moving in its details and challenging to the hearts and consciences of humane men and women everywhere. She says:

"I have been down in Samara in the famine area and have never imagined anything so ghastly. The children are dying along the streets; at every corner someone hunched up against the railings sick and uncared for. A receiving-centre of 469 children brought in off the streets and from the villages is trying to operate but about 42 children die each week; they are all dirty and covered with lice. There is no soap, no food, no medicine, and no efficient help, for the doctors and nurses are ill and exhausted themselves because of hunger. The floors are covered with tiny children who gaze at you with an unearthly gaze—all past crying—as if they are waiting for the unseen deliverer. Other children are there with typhus, dysentery and fever, caused by the eating of leaves and grass . . . three or four on one bench, unwashed, just covered over with sacking.

"The railway station is one mass of evacuated refugees being sent back to the land or the province of their birth. They receive a quarter of a pound of bread per day and the children a little salt and sugar, but they are all starving. You see corpses carried off all day and children groveling under the railway carriages, feverishly licking bits of melon peel and searching the garbage heaps for food, eating dirt, anything. I opened the door leading into a waiting room and saw the corpse of a little child covered with open sores thrown up against the corner like a dead dog. The Government is doing all that it can for all these people; it has succeeded in keeping cholera and typhus in check so far, but unless food and help come quickly there will be fearful epidemics.

"I went to Samara with a crowd of English and American journalists, representing the leading papers, and we were given facts, statistics and all the information we needed. We were motored out to the villages, in a radius of about 30 miles. Driving through the scorched-up country, where even every little stream is dry, the dust rises in clouds, we met wagons of people leaving their homes. Sometimes they were stranded at the roadside, their horses having expired. I counted seven skeletons of horses on this particular road. We found that the peasants had only grass and leaves to live upon, and that the grass had given out in some places. In each home there were benches strewn with birch or lime leaves which are dried, pounded up and mixed with ground acorns or sunflower seeds and with dirt, and are baked into a cakey substance which they call bread and which looks and smells like baked manure.

"The babies die for the mothers have nothing to give them. Almost all the younger children have inflated stomachs, and some are very rickety with match-stick arms and legs. The older people look more normal but they are all clothed in dirty rags, for there is no soap. They are so quiet and philosophical about it.

"We have sent down the first consignment of relief to the Volga region!" Few know what tireless faith and labor and unyielding courage lie behind that effort and the achievement of that success. "We" means the mission of the Quakers, that small body of persons who were ignored or despised in America during the war and some of whom went to prison and suffered there for consistent conscientious objection to war, and who now, as then, in steadfast adherence to the immortal Christian ideal of love and service for their fellow men, through quiet, simple, timely, generous assistance to the hungry and suffering victims of igno-

rance and disaster and hideous crime, have been keeping the torch of hope and civilized life glowing in the waste places of the world, without playing favorites and without any ulterior political purpose to serve, and in so doing have been making the name of America, which dishonored itself in condemning or disowning them, pronounced with gratitude and affection in the ends of the earth.*

Vienna, Austria. BRENT DOW ALLINSON.

Are We Humiliating Mexico?

In the protest against the treaty proposed to Mexico by the United States by which the Obregon government would be granted recognition there is a peculiar lack of the brilliant logical quality which we have come to associate with the Latin mind.

The objections fall into two groups. It is alleged that, (1) the proposals made if agreed to would "humiliate" Mexico and (2) even if that were not the case the making of the sort of treaty suggested is unconstitutional.

These are curious reasonings. What are the facts? Mexico in seeking recognition wishes to be accepted as a nation willing and able to perform her international responsibilities. Among these responsibilities are those to protect the lives and property of the persons resident within her borders and to grant them certain fundamental privileges among which are commonly recognized freedom of speech and of religion. It is obviously illogical to seek that recognition be granted and at the same time refuse to give assurance of intent to assume the responsibilities which recognition presupposes the ability to discharge.

But, it is replied, what is objected to is not the assumption of international responsibilities as these are understood to be involved in recognition. What is objected to is the request that the obligation to carry out these responsibilities be put into a formal treaty —or into a protocol preceding a treaty. Such a proceeding is "humiliating." No self-respecting nation would agree to it. It raises the presumption that the nation which accepts such terms is not to be trusted. Its word is not taken. It is demanded that its duties be recognized in a written instrument which in effect says to the world—"Yes, we recognize you on condition that you do thus and so, but we take your promise in black and white as a condition of recognition." No government could save its face before its constituents if it stooped to such an agreement. Can you imagine your own country—the United States of America, entering any such treaty to respect the rights of foreigners!

The argument has seemed plausible to many, both in this country and abroad. Is it true that such undertakings are exceptional and indicative of subserviency on the part of the nation giving the guarantee? Far from it. In fact, such guarantees are usual in treaties by which relations of amity are sought to be established between nations. There are many such in our international engagements. They are found—and this is of course the most cogent reply,—they are found in our already existing treaty with Mexico binding the United States to the standard of action to which it is now asked that Mexico subscribe. Would the United States do such a thing? Yes. The United States *has done it,*—and with Mexico.

In the treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo concluded February 2, 1848, entered into "to establish upon a solid basis relations of peace and friendship . . . and assure the concord, harmony, and mutual confidence wherein the two peoples should live, as good neighbors," it is provided that in the territories ceded Mexicans may retain "the property which they possess or dispose thereof, and (remove) the proceeds wherever they please, without their being subjected on this account, to any contribution, tax, or charge whatever." "Property of every kind . . . shall be inviolably respected." Mexicans may become United States citizens but till then it is agreed they "shall be maintained and protected in the free enjoyment of their liberty and property and secured in the free exercise of their religion without restriction."

If such guarantees in a treaty are "humiliating" was the United States "humiliated" by the treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo? If they are not humiliating to us why should similar provisions be humiliating to Mexico?

But, it is argued by certain Mexicans, "Even granting for argument's sake that the demands are not humiliating they are none the less unconstitutional. We *can't* agree to such a treaty even if we wish to, for our constitution specifically prohibits the conclusion by the government of any treaty changing the terms of the constitution."

The answer is that the governments represented first by Carranza, later by de la Huerta and now by Obregon have repeatedly insisted that the questionable clauses of the Constitution are not retroactive in character and that vested rights are not disturbed by them. Now this is exactly the assurance which the United States seeks in the proposed treaty. If therefore we are to believe the explicit declarations of the Mexican government the clauses in question do not do what the United States had feared they might be intended to do and if that be true it would not be unconstitutional for the Mexican government to give the assurance in a treaty, for giving it would *not* change the constitution.

Or state it another way. If giving such a statement in a treaty *does* as is now intimated necessitate a change in the constitution how can we have the "full faith and confidence" in the present Mexican Government, which is implied by recognition when we remember its recent protestations. Further in what position will the United States and other "recognizing" governments stand if they accept the Mexican excuse that to give an assurance to protect the rights of foreigners would be "unconstitutional" and grant recognition nevertheless. Once recognized might not Mexico declare—"No! we are under no obligation to change our constitution. You recognized us as a legitimate government knowing we had this constitution and now we propose to keep it. Change our laws concerning foreigners? These laws were in force when you recognized this government. You accepted them when you accepted us." CHESTER LLOYD JONES.

God give us Love—the spirit and the deed—
That we may shape a brotherhood of grace
From out life's chaos of dissevered hearts,
And weave a seamless robe, a living creed
Around the great soul of our struggling race,
Till fellowship become the art of arts.

—*Arthur B. Pratten.*

*Contributions for relief should be sent to the Russian Famine Fund (Quakers), 15 Park Row, New York City.

"Democracy and World Relations"*

Dr. Jordan's "Democracy and World Relations" awakens in the impartial reader a wonderful impression, that of absolute clearness. To explain this, it should be recognized that in Germany an author usually sets forth everything, the most difficult conceptions in the terminology peculiar to his science. He puts forth whatever is in his own mind, regardless of its divergence from the thoughts of the laity and regardless of the ability of the public to follow his assertions.

With Dr. Jordan the method is quite otherwise. He goes directly at the delicate matters of which he treats with avoidance of technicalities, wholly unknown here. Every new word, every new conception is not only made clear, but it is logically, often historically, based —and all these conceptions through a transparent and above all crisp and epigrammatic style, are bound together in a harmonious whole.

The book thus unites in itself two rare and surprising qualities. First it treats on a most difficult matter concerning Germany especially and of the greatest human interest—on a scientific-historical basis. Secondly, it deals with its material in the clearest and most direct fashion in language which the general reader cannot fail to understand. These two virtues alone should promise the book a wide circulation in Germany, and as to the theme itself, it is a great misfortune for Germany that those books which serve to tell the truth in public affairs, those who would bring ethics into political life—those who to the German mind would tear the mask from the face of Pangermanism, have been under the ban of the censor. Thus such writings have failed in results, their voices falling unheard in the winds while a little circle of assumed race-knowledge poses as a new version of our national problems.

Never before in Germany to our knowledge have the vital matters been set forth in such clear and transparent fashion or been so justly stated, reviewed and weighed as in this volume. An author with us, having such wealth of material, would have gathered it into three thick volumes, never in the short and sharp form in which in one hundred and fifty pages it is condensed by Dr. Jordan.

Of the content itself, including the verdicts of the author, we must declare ourselves in full sympathy and especially with the direct and pointed exposition of the dynamic state as an illustration of the mentality of the Wilhelmisehen epoch. It is especially helpful, too, that the book gives an outline of the actualities of democracy. It contains not only a positive statement of its ideals and purpose but it also discloses the nature and causes of its temporary failures and perversions. The chapters "Internationalism and Federation" and "International Law, Arbitration and Conciliation" form together what we would call "Practical Pacifism." They show the new way and furnish us a complete answer to those who call us idealists and unpractical dreamers. This thought which has often moved us brings us into sympathy with the author. Again and again, on both sides, right and left, we have striven to bring the idea of justice into public affairs. We have hoped to join people together in agreement, to secure the acceptance of International Law before which all peoples should bow, to acquire an international executive which should interpret obedience to law without which it would be international justice in appearance only.

In our schools we have all learned Greek history and we have learned how the makers of Greece, Athens and Sparta met in slaughter and went down. This drama repeats itself today after two thousand years, not now in Greece the peninsula of Europe, but in Europe itself the peninsula of Asia.

The disturber of peace is thrown prone on the ground. Dr. Jordan gives the details of his downfall in his appendix on "Pangermanism," in reality the diagnosis of a sick nation. Here lies the hindrance to a peaceful development which we all desire. If the malady is not healed no torch of freedom can illumine the world. And, must we say it? The sickness is infectious; if no remedy can be secured we shall never gain peace.

Meanwhile, there comes to us the call of President Harding for disarmament. We have heard in the University of Berlin, the rector, Professor Seckel, present his greetings to Rabindranath Tagore for his message of world understanding. To the ear accustomed to cries of revenge, this is a notable relief—a hopeful symptom. The doctrine of peace from which we have wandered far must soon be clearly set forth before the pressure of war has passed away. To that end the book before us is as though specially created. To its conciliating and lucid exposition of world condition, keen attention in Germany is demanded and a large following ensured.

*A condensed and in places slightly paraphrased translation of a review of Jordan's "Democracy and World Relations," by Friedrich Zimmermann, of Berlin, a German democrat.

CORRESPONDENCE

An International Federation of Churches and Ministers for the Abolition of War

Dear UNITY:

Verily, now is the time, now if ever, for an International Federation of Churches and Ministers whose sole object shall be the abolition of War. The tragedy of the great struggle when nearly all the churches of this and other countries, threw themselves into the game, is fresh in our minds. Before such a federation is possible, however, is it not necessary to have clearer thinking on the subject of this "game" as I am moved to call it?

Mr. Holmes has said in his book, "New Wars for Old," that wars are made behind closed doors by the few,—and we all know that they are for the benefit of the few! How they get their way in this game in spite of the innate hate of people for mass murder (which is legalized under the name of war) must be understood first of all. The press, which tells us what to think, and which so largely forms public opinion, and which is controlled by the powers that profit by war and bring on wars,—this unites with the platform, the pulpit, the "movie," the teacher and the politician to help create the war psychology. Preparedness parades and similar demonstrations which appeal to the emotions of the people, are powerful factors. But there is something else that we people who hate war are not so near to comprehending. I refer to the subtle glorification of war which turns the eyes and minds of men and women from its horrors, and

THE FIELD.

WOMEN'S INTERNATIONAL LEAGUE FOR PEACE AND FREEDOM.

This Bulletin goes out simultaneously with Mr. Hughes' hopeful pronouncement of a great step leading towards the end for which the League is working—complete and universal disarmament, and understanding among the nations. But the Washington Office sends urgent word to all members that there is still need for constant and forceful expression of public opinion directed to the President, Secretary Hughes, and the press. There should be a steady flow of letters and telegrams expressing appreciation for what has already been done, and urging that our country take the lead in working for complete and universal disarmament. We earnestly hope that each member will feel a personal responsibility in this matter. The Washington Office is organizing street meetings and parlor meetings; it is arranging slogans to be used on moving picture slides and is planning other activities. The new office is located at 732 Seventeenth Street, N. W., near and on the way to the Conference. We are watching the Conference. We are starting the new office with $200 in the treasury. We must have more at once. Will you help us? Pay your annual dues and make a little contribution however small!

The American program for a naval holiday was an auspicious opening for the Disarmament Conference. But we must not forget that it was only that. The limitation of armies is a vastly more intricate problem. It embraces the whole scheme of European and Asiatic politics, leads to revelations concerning the economic ends sought by the nations participating in the Conference, and cannot fail to expose the duplicity and stupidity of modern statesmanship. There can be no real disarmament while all Europe is armed. This important phase of the Conference is yet to be considered. Real lasting agreements can only be arrived at through open sessions. The League must use its influence toward that end. Again we urge letters and telegrams to the President and Secretary Hughes asking full publicity.

As the Bulletin goes to press Mr. Balfour's speech assures us that he is only too conscious of the seriousness of the question of limitation of armies. Commending Mr. Hughes' program, he went on to emphasize the fact that it does not touch "the question of land armaments which every one coming from Europe feels to be of paramount importance."

The League has important work to do in this phase of the disarmament problem. We must work to crystallize the sentiments of our foreign members so that it may make its influence felt on the Conference sitting here.

A great mass meeting called by the District of Columbia's Women's Committee for Limitation of Armaments and representing every woman's organization in the country was held in Washington on Disarmament Sunday. Delegates from foreign countries, including Madame Inouye from Japan and Kate Manicom sent by the International Congress of Working Women at Geneva, the four women members of the Advisory Council and representatives of all the women's organizations voiced their sentiments for the limitation of armaments, and enthusiasm for the naval program announced by Mr. Hughes.

The League took part in this meeting not because we favor "limitation" of armaments rather than "disarmament," but because we feel that we should seize every opportunity to co-operate with any organization that is working toward our goal as long as we make our own position clear and distinct. We must not cease to remember the most effective work is done through co-operation.

Mrs. Burch speaking at the meeting for the League, after reading the cable messages from women of Sweden, Switzerland, France and Austria, all declaring that absolute disarmament was the only hope, stated emphatically that the League stood for complete and universal disarmament and believed it safe, sane and necessary.

Mid-Winter Conference.

A mid-winter conference of the League has been arranged to take place on Saturday, December 10, at 10 A. M., at the Grace Dodge Hotel, 20 E Street, N. W., Washington, D. C. Fifty women can be accommodated at the hotel, rooms ranging from $2 to $4 per day. Reservations must be made in advance. At the Conference, Miss Balch will report fully on the Vienna Congress, and activities for the winter will be discussed.

Mass Meeting.

On Sunday afternoon, following the Conference, a mass meeting will be held at the New Masonic Temple, Thirteenth Street and New York Avenue. Miss Addams and others, we hope several foreign women among them, will appear.

These are parlous times in Washington, and the League should have a very well attended convention. The women of the world cannot be too emphatic in voicing their sentiments for complete and universal disarmament.

---

the aftermath of famine, pestilence, and insanity. It may be the artist, who depicts with the brush of a genius some incident of bravery; the novelist, who creates a war hero surrounded by a halo of theatriscenes and impossible incidents; a great sculptor, like Thorwaldsen, who designs a wonderful monument to the memory of the unforgivable slaughter of the fit in the interests of the unfit. The artists are always to be had to glorify Moloch,—for fame or money, or to get emotional relief themselves. Not that they realize what they are doing. Far from it. Like the duped men who die in the trenches or crash to earth from an aeroplane, they know not that they are being used by those who are not fit to tie their shoe-laces.

To-day we have a new method of glorifying war,—of binding more securely the shackles of the people, who in the last analysis, fight the war, suffer from it and in it, and pay for it. We bury an "Unknown Soldier," just at a time when people are perilously near to understanding just what war has brought them, and is to pass on to their children. Europe started this custom, and the United States, on the eve of what may prove to be a Conference leading up to the abolition of armies and navies, is led to turn its thoughts away from the serious business of preventing further horror, to a contemplation of the "dignity of sorrow and the glory of death under fire." The war mothers and the unknown soldiers stir our best emotions, and turn our hearts and minds from the six million unemployed, the mothers dead from grief or slowly starving for lack of the support that would have been theirs had not the business of killing taken away that support. This spectacle keeps us from dwelling over-long on unpleasant things, such as for instance the fact that the number of those disabled and diseased by war is to-day, in 1921, about eight times as many as in 1919,—a fact that is blazoned on posters displayed all over the city of New York, but thoughtlessly overlooked. It prevents us from giving thought to the reports of our scientists who are discovering new and more dangerous poisonous gases, acids and disease germs, to be the weapons of the next war. We are dazzled by the well-rounded phrases of those in high places, testifying to the bravery of our boys and the beauty of their death, so that we fail to see things as they are. These phrases are spread all over the land by our newspapers that during the war repressed the tales of horror, and since the war have so carefully repressed the truth about the economic breakdown that threatens Europe and the misery that stalks among the defeated and the victor nations alike. We are still held in the grip of the war psychology created by those who do not fight but make the "conscripted" to fight. As long as they can keep the common man from realizing the awfulness of war, as long as they can keep us from thinking clearly about this legalized and respectable murder, the game will go merrily on; ministers and churches everywhere will further it, glorify it, and support it. We shall wear our bonds as long as we do not know we are being held, or as long as we can be made to think that our shackles are necessary, splendid and God-ordained.

CAROLIN B. TOWNER

It's a "Case" of Necessity

Your Printing will be above criticism if done by

THE OAKLAND PRESS

728 E. 39th Street
Phone Douglas 244

WRIGHT & COMPANY

STEAM—DOMESTIC

COAL

TELEPHONE WABASH 5028
Main Office:
28 E. Jackson Blvd.
CHICAGO

The Blakely-Oswald Printing Co.

PRINTERS and BINDERS

Telephone Wabash 3854 120-124 W. Polk St., CHICAGO

Bowman Dairy Company

MILK BOTTLED IN THE COUNTRY

Milk Cream Butter Buttermilk

DO OUR WAGONS SERVE YOU?
WHY NOT HAVE THE BEST?

4221-4229 State Street Telephones at all Division Offices

EVANSTON CHICAGO OAK PARK

DREXEL State Bank

Cottage Grove Ave. and Oakwood Blvd.

Thirty-two years of conservative banking, combined with service and courtesy for every depositor—large or small—is the record of this bank . . . . . .

Your savings and checking account cordially invited

Resources Six and one-half Million Dollars

Schumann & Company

Cleaners of

FANCY GOWNS AND KID GLOVES

Having winter garments cleaned before storing them will keep out moth

PHONE DREXEL 221
ALL DEPARTMENTS

MAIN OFFICE AND WORK:
3954 Cottage Grove Avenue

A Good Time to Subscribe for UNITY—*Now!*

$160,000 MUST BE RAISED NOW

for The Community Church

Park Ave. and Thirty-fourth St.

New York City

Our Church Buildings, destroyed by fire in September, 1919, are to be rebuilt in 1922.

The cost of the enterprise kept at the lowest possible figure, is estimated as follows:

Construction and furnishing of church auditorium	$121,700
Organ	30,000
Church House	65,300
	$217,000

Funds now on hand are as follows:

Building Fund		$11,870
Insurance and General Fund—		
Cash	$ 8,291	
Securities	33,330	
		41,621
		$53,491

Money to be raised $163,509

By unanimous vote of the Society, our new buildings, when completed, are to be re-dedicated "to that religion which is service of humanity; to our traditional freedom of speech; to hospitality to all men and women of the community, without regard to sect, class, nation or race; and to the usage, without fear or favor, of that spirit of communal love which shall some day bring in upon the earth the ideal society."

There are thousands of people in New York and throughout the country who believe in this kind of a church which is free of dogmas and ecclesiastical traditions of every kind, in the interest of a wider, fuller, nobler life of brotherhood.

We are asking these people to contribute to our cause.

Send checks to
JOHN W. FRANK, *Treasurer*
Building Fund Committee
61 EAST 34TH STREET
NEW YORK CITY